

Delivery Order Decision Document

On May 8 and 9, 2000, the evaluation team for the Internet Protocol (IP)-Based Satellite Study met and reviewed the proposals received from the Rapid II contract holders.

Delivery Order Description

This Delivery Order is for an IP-Based Satellite Study, which is an accommodation assessment to determine the range of suitable architectures and technologies to provide IP-based satellite services. Of primary importance will be to identify critical gaps in technology, where modest investment can make a significant long-term impact on the way NASA Enterprises conduct their space missions. The studies will focus on meeting performance requirements of identifying IP-architecture concepts, key technologies and components.

Five offers were submitted for this requirement. Those responses were reviewed as described in the Delivery Order request for offer. The five offers were from:

Ball Aerospace & Technologies, Inc.
Orbital Sciences Corp.
Spectrum Astro, Inc.
Surrey Satellite Technology, LTD.
TRW, Inc.

Evaluation Procedures

An evaluation team consisting of RSDO personnel and IP study team members from LeRC and GSFC conducted the evaluation of proposals. The evaluation team evaluated each proposal against the evaluation criteria identified in the RFO as follows:

- a) Suitability for the IP Study – NASA will evaluate the offeror's proposed approach and concept for accomplishing the activities reflected in the SOW and meeting the IP Service Goals (Attachment B). The concept for implementing the IP-Based satellite architecture will be evaluated for applicability to the Earth Science and Space Science Enterprises future missions. Any new heritage or availability, beyond that specified in the IDIQ contract, of space flight components, subsystems, and systems will also be evaluated
- b) Price – The reasonableness of the proposed price shall be evaluated including consideration of the funding limitation of \$60K per delivery order.
- c) Past Performance – Experience in Internet engineering principals and practices and awareness of existing and planned related systems will be evaluated. Any new relevant experience or past performance beyond that submitted in the RSA proposals will be examined.

Evaluation Team Members:

Jerry Edmond	GSFC
William Watson	GSFC
Phil Paulsen	LeRC
Will Ivanic	LeRC
Kul Bhasin	LeRC
Mike Pasciuto	GSFC
Rick Schnurr	GSFC
Glenn Prescott	GSFC/U. Kansas

Evaluation Results

Ball – Ball’s proposal was evaluated and determined to be unacceptable. Ball received major weaknesses in mission suitability. The Ball proposed price was considered to be fair and reasonable and there were no past performance concerns.

Orbital – Orbital’s proposal was evaluated and determined to be acceptable. Orbital received strengths in mission suitability and no major weaknesses. The Orbital proposed price was considered to be fair and reasonable and there were no past performance concerns.

Spectrum Astro – Spectrum Astro’s proposal was evaluated and determined to be acceptable. Spectrum Astro received major strengths in mission suitability and no major weaknesses. The Spectrum Astro proposed price was considered to be fair and reasonable and there were no past performance concerns.

Surrey – Surrey’s proposal was evaluated and determined to be acceptable. Surrey received major strengths and one weakness in mission suitability. The Surrey proposed price was considered to be fair and reasonable and there were no past performance concerns.

TRW – TRW’s proposal was evaluated and determined to be acceptable. TRW received strengths in mission suitability and no major weaknesses. The TRW proposed price was considered to be fair and reasonable and there were no past performance concerns.

Decision

Based on the foregoing, I select Orbital Sciences Corp., Spectrum Astro Inc., Surrey Satellite Technology Ltd. and TRW Inc. for receipt of Delivery Orders for the Rapid II IP-Based Satellite studies. I therefore determine that, based on the evaluation team findings, that the four offers recommended for selection represent a fair and reasonable price to the Government.

William A. Watson
Associate Chief, RSDO

Concurrence:
John H. Campbell
Director, Flight Programs and Projects Directorate